

The Philanthropist.

JAMES G. BIRNEY, EDITOR.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother *** therefore, is this distress come upon us.

A. PUGH, PRINTER.

VOLUME I.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1836.

NUMBER 30.

THE PHILANTHROPIST

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

BY THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

(Publishing Room, corner of Seventh and Main Sts.)

Terms.

Two Dollars per annum, always payable in ADVANCE. Letters and Communications on business of the Office should be directed to AUGUSTUS WATTERS, relating to the Editorial Department to the Editor of the Philanthropist. In all cases post-paid.

Names of Counties should be particularly mentioned in giving directions for sending the paper.

An Advertisement making one square or less, will be inserted three times for one dollar.

PRO-SLAVERY ECCLESIASTICS.

From Zion's Watchman.

New York Annual Conference.

We had hoped to be able to make our readers acquainted with the doings of this body, at its recent session in this city, more fully than we find room to do in our present number. We have, however, some data in our possession, from which we shall supply this defect in our future numbers.

The Report, Resolutions, and proceedings of this body on the subject of Anti-Slavery, will form an epoch in the history of Methodism. The question now to be decided by a large number of its members, is not simply whether the colored man ought to have the Bible, and the rights of humanity restored to him, but whether they, themselves, will be free! On the attempts which have been made, and the measures taken to prevent brethren in this conference from speaking against slavery, and to prohibit them from receiving or patronizing, or even reading a paper called "Zion's Watchman," we may speak more particularly at another time.

It so happened, that the first time we visited the Conference, the Report was under consideration, which is given in another column of our present number. When the resolution was proposed relating to this paper, we requested the privilege of making a few remarks to the Conference. This request was granted by the president, Bishop Heddington, and by him, we were treated, while we were attempting to speak, with the utmost propriety, but we do not remember as he pronounced any one "out of order," for interrupting us in the manner they did.

This was on Saturday, the 25th ult. On the following Wednesday, the editor of this paper presented the following communication, in an extra of the Watchman, to the Conference. It was accompanied with a note to the President, as follows:

New York, June 29, 1836.

DEAR BROTHER,—It will probably be remembered by the members of the New York Annual Conference, that on Saturday last, I proposed to furnish them with the number of Zion's Watchman, containing the article which I had written, in allusion to the extract which was read before that body on the morning of that day. I have now to request, that the brethren should be informed that copies of the paper are present, and may be had at the door of this church, of the Sexton.

I wish the Conference also to be informed, that I have furnished an Extra of the Watchman for this week, containing what I have to say in relation to some remarks made in this Conference, at the time above-named, affecting my character; a document which I hope every member of this Conference will do me the justice to read, especially such as have thought that I was implicated in any thing which was said here in relation to the Watchman, on that day.

In relation to the Extra, it may be proper to add, that it has not been published, and if any brother should think that there is any error in it, which ought to prevent its publication, he is requested to inform me of such error as soon as may be convenient.

Respectfully,

LA ROY SUNDERLAND.

REV. BISHOP HEDDING.

It is with extreme reluctance that we give the following document a place in our paper. We have always felt an instinctive dread against saying anything in a public journal, which might be construed into a criticism of any christian brother. But the resolution of the New York Conference, condemning this paper, as calculated to sow "dissension in the Church," has gone abroad to the world, and the remarks made in the Conference in support of that resolution, were heard, not only by the preachers, for whom this Extra was designed, but by a promiscuous assembly, as many spectators had come into the Conference that morning, having heard, we suppose, as we had, that the Report on Abolition would be acted on, and with that Report, it was anticipated also by many, that the Watchman would be condemned.

The Watchman was condemned—and our readers have a right to know how this was done, and the reasons why. It will have been observed, that we requested the Conference to point out to us any error in the following communication, which ought to prevent its publication; but no one has attempted to do so. The paragraphs enclosed in brackets have been added since the Extra was presented to the Conference.

New York Conference vs. Zion's Watchman.

The statements made before the New York Conference, on the 25th inst. concerning Zion's Watchman, and the charges preferred there against its editor, it is believed, render it his duty to offer a few remarks for the consideration of those who heard those charges, and who may now feel willing to read what he would have said on that occasion, but for reasons which will be stated below.

If he should say, that it was a most singular proceeding to him, to be charged with "falsehood" and "slander," before a Conference of ministers of which he was not a member, and to whom he was almost an entire stranger, and that it was still more singular to hear these charges repeated so frequently before that body, in the spirit and manner which astonished not a few who witnessed them, it would, perhaps, be saying what has already occurred to most of those for whom these remarks are designed.

But I suppose no one will imagine, that I can feel insensible to the injury which was inflicted upon me by the statements made in the New York Conference, by some of its members, on the 25th inst.; statements made in such a way as put it utterly beyond the power of any one to show, at that time, that they were false or unjust. For how could it be shown before that body, that Zion's Watchman was not calculated to produce dissensions in the Methodist E. Church, except by an appeal to the general character of the paper, and an examination of the various subjects discussed in it? How could it be shown that the general character of the paper was not "slanderous?" Could this be done by an appeal to one solitary paragraph of some ten or twelve lines?

the method which one or two brethren took to fix upon its editor the charge of base "slander of every Methodist preacher in the country!"

But before noticing more particularly the implications he referred to, it may be proper to premise a few things: they are facts which it is of importance for those members of the New-York Conference to know, who deemed it proper, on Saturday last, to judge and condemn this paper, and a paper which they confessed they were not in the habit of reading!

1. Zion's Watchman is not, and never was the property of its editor; it was not started by him, nor by any other person out of this city. The paper was determined on without my knowledge, by a few members of the Methodist E. Church.

2. This paper is pledged to the interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Constitution of the Society by which it is published provides that it shall always be edited by a regularly licensed preacher in this Church; and this, it is believed, secures it against any course which would be likely to bring it into collision with our doctrines or discipline. No such pledge has been given by the publishers of any other Methodist paper, that we know of, in the country.

Soon after this paper was commenced, it was read in the Christian Advocate and Journal, that it professed to be "as much an official organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church as is the Christian Advocate and Journal." This is not true, nor has that paper seen fit fairly to correct this statement.—This paper never professed to be in any sense, "an official organ" of the Church, and why this incorrect statement was made about it, and left, as it has been, without a full and fair correction, we are left to conjecture. It was partially corrected, but not fully.

Now, if any errors had appeared in this paper, affecting the characters of individuals like those referred to in the Conference last Saturday; should not the editor have been informed as to those errors by the person who saw them, or those whom they concerned? Should not such errors be corrected in the paper that had published them? Let me ask, dear brethren, by what rule of propriety or ecclesiastical usage, a resolution is introduced into a Conference of nearly two hundred ministers, to condemn this paper as likely to sow "dissensions" in the Church, when but a very few of that whole body had ever seen or read two numbers of it? And further, suffer me to ask, by what rule of discipline, a brother, a stranger, and a member of another Conference, is openly accused before your body of FALSEHOOD, or of having made FALSE STATEMENTS, and of SLANDER, when that brother has had no previous private admonition concerning these charges from any one! A brother and a stranger charged in an open Conference of Methodist ministers with falsehood and slander; and this, too, without affording him any previous privilege of explanation, any previous call for correction, or any previous opportunity for defence! A brother was understood to say, that he had written me, or privately reproved me in some way for the offences charged against me in the Conference on Saturday last; but he erred in the statement. Neither that brother, nor any member of the New York conference, ever wrote to me, or communicated with me, in *any way*, about those charges, previous to my hearing them stated on the Conference floor. And as I think, I was at frequent, and, as I think, unscrupulously interrupted by certain members of the Conference—and especially as I was charged with making false statements in the course of what I did say, I deem it proper to take this method for preventing the injustice which those charges are calculated to do me, as well as the Church of which I am a member.

1. A brother (Dr. Bangs) charged me with having made a false statement about himself, in that I had published in the Watchman a private conversation, in part, or in whole, in which I falsely represented him as having justified or defended slavery. But had I thought this would have been the better way to show him and the Conference the injur to which he did me in this statement, I might have charged him with "falsehood" in making it, because I never published an account of such a private conversation with him! [At least, I have no recollection of doing so, nor can I find any such account in any number of the Watchman. If Dr. B. will point out to me the place to which he refers, this statement shall be promptly corrected.]

Now let me ask, what it was that directed that brother's attention to certain conversations which he had held with me? What was it, that directed his attention to any one or more particular conversations, if he was not apprehensive that in some conversation with me, he had used language which was justly liable to such a construction as he thought I had given to it?

But though I stated to the Conference, that I had no recollection of publishing an account of the conversation alluded to, yet I did recollect having had such a conversation, in which I understood him to attempt a justification of slaveholding, or holding men as property. But in making this statement, he interrupted me with another charge of falsehood. But I suppose every person who heard this denial, saw at once, from his own account of one conversation which he said he had held with me, that he used language which was justly liable to this construction, because he said he "alluded to the slavery of a man who was imprisoned for crime, and asked if that was sin," or words to this effect. But why did he allude to the case of a man deprived of his liberty for crime? Was it to condemn slavery, or to justify it?

Though I know, and I think I observed at the time, that depriving a man of his liberty who had committed a crime, was not SLAVERY, because he was not held and treated as property; he could neither be bought nor sold; yet an allusion to such a case, proves that remarks were made in connection with such an allusion, which were liable to be understood as designed to justify slaveholding, and to show that it was not, as I was contending, a sin against God.

And a brother said to Dr. Bangs, while I was speaking before the Conference, after he was understood to deny his ever having attempted to justify slavery, that he had made such an attempt in a conversation with him! [in which Dr. B. said that "slavery was in itself sinful,"* or "was not a sin under all circumstances," but this the Doctor does not consider a justification of slavery!] Now, suppose I had called upon this brother, or any other, in whose hearing I knew that Dr. Bangs had said that slaveholding was not a sin against God, would this have been in order? And yet, he was understood to "challenge" me to give the proof before that Conference, that he ever attempted to justify slavery!

* And what is a sin in itself, considered? Is falsehood a sin, in itself? Is adultery a sin, in itself considered? Now, if slavery is not a sin in itself, how can it be called a sin under certain circumstances? And who does not see, that this view of the subject, makes the sin always consist in the circumstances of slavery, and never in SLAVERY ITSELF!?

2. Another objection made by Dr. Bangs against the Watchman was, that it had stated that he had quoted Scripture in defence of slavery, and this he was understood to deny that he had ever done. The following is the language of Dr. Bangs, and which I believe, and do still believe, will fairly admit of such a construction. It is found in the 431st No. of the Christian Advocate and Journal.

"We say, if they will imitate the conduct of the apostles, and we might add, that of Jesus Christ, At the time he made his appearance in our world, slavery existed all over the Roman empire, not excepting even the highly favored land of Judea, to such an extent, that it has been estimated that about one-half of the population of that vast empire were in a state of civil bondage. This must have been well known to Jesus Christ and his apostles. But notwithstanding this, when Jesus Christ sent out his apostles to preach, did he give them a command to denounce those masters because they held slaves, and to tell them that unless they let the oppressed go free, they could not repent and enter into the Kingdom of heaven? Nothing of this. We do not recollect a single instance of his having uttered a word on this subject.

"And did not his apostles imitate their Divine Master in regard to this thing? Where do we find them hurling the anathemas of heaven against those numerous slave-holders whom they addressed, because they held their fellow creatures in bondage?"

On the contrary, we find the apostle Paul especially giving specific directions to masters and servants, on continuing their d ties and behavior toward each other—exhorting 'servants to be obedient to their own masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto Christ—not with eye service, as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart.' And ye masters, do the same thing unto your slaves, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there any respect of persons with him.' See Eph. vi. 5, 6, 7, and Col. v. 22: 1 Tim. vi. 1. And in connection with the passage above quoted: 'If thou mayest be free, use it rather,' he has these words, 'Let every man abide in the calling wherein he is called. Art thou called, being a servant, care not for it.'

"From all this, it appears evident, that however much the apostle might have deprecated slavery as it then existed throughout the Roman empire, he did not feel it his duty, as an ambassador of Christ, to disturb those relations which subsisted between masters and servants, by denouncing slavery as such a mortal sin, that they could not be 'servants to Christ' in such a relation."

The abolitionists, concerning whom the article was written of which the above is a part, speak of slaveholding as a sin against God, but the author of the above is attempting to show the contrary, and to justify or defend slavery from this charge of criminality by a number of considerations.

Slavery existed under the immediate eye of Christ; about one half of the Roman empire were in a state of slavery at the time he was upon earth; and—

1. He did not direct his apostles to say anything against it.

2. Jesus Christ himself did not utter a word upon this subject.

3. Holding slaves is not an act to be repented of, so that without such repentance, a slaveholder cannot be saved; hence it is not a sin, as is affirmed by the abolitionists.

4. The apostles did not reprove any one for holding slaves, hence it was not deemed a sin by them, though they might have deprecated its existence.

5. The apostles gave specific direction both to slaveholders and the enslaved, without condemning slavery, from whence it is inferred, that slavery was not a sin. And

6. The apostles did nothing to disturb those relations between slaveholders and the slaves, from which we could infer that slavery is sin against God.

The foregoing I believe to be simple and fair constructions of language which Dr. Bangs used in justification of slavery; and yet for stating in Zion's Watchman, and before the Conference last Saturday, that he had quoted scripture for this purpose, he charged me with FALSEHOOD!

Now suppose the above language had been used concerning any other evil, in the same way, let us see how it would read:

"At the time Jesus Christ made his appearance in the world, polygamy existed all over the Roman empire, not excepting the land of Judea. This was well known to Jesus Christ and his apostles, yet Jesus Christ never uttered one word against it, and his apostles imitated him in this thing; they never said one word against it, but on the contrary, they gave to the husband and his wife specific directions for the regulation of their conduct."

And then had some eight or ten passages of scripture been quoted as instances of those "specific directions" to a man and his wife, could a brother be justly charged with falsehood for saying the writer of the above had quoted scripture in defence of polygamy!—What could scripture be quoted in such a connection for, if not to defend polygamy? And if Dr. Bangs did not quote the foregoing passages for the purpose of defending a *slavery*, what did he quote them for? What was his design? And must a brother be openly and publicly charged with falsehood because he may have given a construction to another's language which it was so obviously liable to bear?

Now it must be remembered, that I have never accused Dr. Bangs with quoting scripture in defence of American slavery, or of Roman slavery, or of Greek slavery, nor of the evils of slavery, nor of the abuses of the system, but what I said was, that he had quoted scripture in defence of slavery;* and yet for making this statement, for which I have the above authority, he interrupted me, in the course of my remarks before the Conference, and the spectators assembled in the church on that occasion, and pronounced me guilty of FALSEHOOD!

But whether there was any breach of courtesy in this, or whether any rule of propriety dictated the enunciation of such a charge against a brother, in the presence of the Conference to whom he was a stranger, I leave for those who heard what he said to determine.

Those who heard the frequent allusions which Dr. Bangs has made during the present session of the Conference, to Zion's Watchman, in which he has called it "a scurrilous paper," full of mista-

[* By which I understood him to mean, as stated before, the act by which one man holds and treats another as property. That Dr. B. would attempt to justify this act under all possible circumstances, I never believed, nor would any slave-holder in the land, probably attempt to do this. My inference from what this brother has said, is that the sin of slavery consisted not in slavery, *in itself*, but in the question between him and me, is simply this: Has he ever used any language which might be fairly construed into this sense?

If Dr. B. now says, that he never meant to be so understood, I admit it; but should he be charged with falsehood, for giving the language which he has used; such a construction as it is most obviously liable to bear?

ments, &c., and who have not read the Watchman, may wonder at the course he has pursued with regard to this paper and its editor; but if they will be at the trouble to read the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th numbers of the Watchman, they will find the offence which has cost me the friendship of one whom I always esteemed as a good man, and which has drawn down upon me from him such a weight of opposition. They will find in those numbers the following complaints made:

"1. The Christian Advocate and Journal has indiscriminately applied to the abolitionists uncourteous and unchristian names. It has given an incorrect and mischievous view of their sentiments upon the subject of slavery, by denouncing them in severe and censorious language, and at the same time it has refused them the privilege of explaining their views where they believed they were misunderstood, or of defending themselves against the unjust charges which they believed that paper had published against them."

"II. That the Christian Advocate and Journal has been partial, unfair, and unjust in its course towards individual brethren, in censuring them by name, and refusing to give them the opportunity of defending their characters, or of offering through its columns any explanation whereby they might remove the mischief its censures were calculated to do them.

"III. That the course of our official paper with regard to two of the Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, has been unfair, partial, and unjust."

These complaints against the Christian Advocate and Journal, the editor of the Watchman felt it his duty to prefer, after using, without effect, other means to obtain redress, and they are supported in numbers of this paper before named by about thirty quotations from the Christian Advocate and Journal; and neither of these complaints and all singular which is said in support of them, the senior or editor of that paper has never deemed it safe or proper to deny.

It is painful to loose the good will of any good man, but it is more painful still to wrong my conscience and sin against my God.—I know of no principle of christian conduct by which I should be prevented from striving as I may deem it my duty, to prevent the mischief which a large proportion of the ministry and membership of the church, to which I belong, believe is likely to be brought upon it by the course of conduct pursued by any individual. No considerations of private friendship, or ease, or emolument, or honor, shall prevent me from discharging what I believe to be my duty.

3. I come now to the paragraph in the 25th number of the Watchman, entitled "An avowed enemy." I have been asked why I made no reply to the speech of the Rev. P. P. Sandford, in relation to this paragraph, accusing me as he did of "publishing profanity"—and of "slanderizing every minister in the M. E. Church." I answer after what I had already said in relation to it, I deemed it unworthy of any reply from me. How a minister of the gospel, of his age, could suffer himself to be led into such a strain of censure, and labor as he did to fix the charge of *slander* upon the character of another.

4. Holding slaves is not an act to be repented of, so that without such repentance, a slaveholder cannot be saved; hence it is not a sin, as is affirmed by the abolitionists.

5. The apostles did not reprove

From the Pittsburgh Conference Journal.
Our Country in Danger.

It requires but a limited knowledge of the rise and fall of nations, to perceive that the seeds of dissolution are sown in this country, and that they have fallen in a genial soil. In a purer period of our history a mob was a matter of rare occurrence, and when any "lewd fellows of the bawd" did unite, more effectually to accomplish their nefarious designs, the church and state were also united, at least in denouncing them as deserving universal condemnation. There being no fuel to feed the unhallowed flame, kindled in their temerity, the fire was soon extinguished, and nothing more was heard but the reported trial and conviction of the offenders. Those were halcyon days, when a pure brightness shone upon the length and breadth of our Republic, interrupted by an occasional cloud only, and a still less frequent storm; for such events like angel's visits, were "few and far between."

But "how is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed!" Mobs, and duels, and riots, and insurrections have actually become fashionable, and are spoken of, 'tis true occasionally with disapprobation, but as events to be looked for, nay, in some instances, as indispensable!

We are told that certain evils, and evil men of certain classes, cannot be reached by law, and therefore a new code has been gotten up without trouble of legislation, which is to be put in force whenever a mob shall see proper, without indictment, jury or judge! And, moreover, the poor wretch, whether virtuous or vicious, who happens to fall into the hands of these mobocratical gentrified, with a doctor or an esquire at their head, and a general or a corporal as their secretary, has no appeal, no space allotted for repentance, not even the benefit of clergy—he must be tarred, and feathered, and burnt, or hung, or shot—in a word, he must be lynched!

Now, that some who have suffered the penalty of this code have deserved all that they have met with, is not questionable, as the Southern gamblers for instance. But who does not see that the blind and intoxicated mob does not stop at that much—it makes the righteous suffer with the wicked. From the tender mercies of a government, administered by such hands, we pray to be delivered! We have somewhere read, that "custom is a tyrant who seldom consults reason before he issues orders, and who generally knows no law but self-will and caprice." When that of misrule and violence is once established; who will then, ratify it? It is told of Harley, Lord Oxford, Ann's Tory Minister, that when objection was made by some person to a proposed measure, on the ground that the people never would bear it, he replied, "You don't know how far the good people of England will bear." He lived to learn the danger of practicing too extensively upon this maxim. And so will those persons who adopt it in this country. A future Congress will restore the right of petition, so as sure as the people know their rights, and knowing dare maintain them. And the inevitable consequences of thus forcibly joining, against all the dictates of sound sense the right of petition with the abolition of slavery, will only be to give to the latter an appearance of success which it might not otherwise have had. But if superadded upon this, the cause of liberty of speech, so fearfully trampled down to effect the passage of Pinckney's resolution, is also to be invaded, and all the persons who take up the argument in these, are to be forthwith denounced as abolitionists, then should the spirit of the American people be hereafter what it has been, no ghost will be needed to tell us, that before long the abolition cause, thus artificially matured, will be the cause of the great majority in the Free States. Should this result, certainly to be dreaded and deplored, be once brought about, it will then be worse than idle to indulge in crimination and recrimination as to who first set the ball rolling. It will then serve no useful end to attach censure to this, or the other person. *The harm will have been done.* The sincerest repentance will avail nothing in the way of correction. How much better then to desist in time—not to add fuel to the fire by ill-judged electioneering accusations, but by narrowing down the merits of the abolition question to its simplest form and most natural limits, to cut off the chance of evils which once brought out would be found next to impossible to remove.

I hope I have not given occasion for any mistake of my meaning. I am not, myself, an abolitionist, nor disposed to go a step out of my way merely to aid their cause. Whatever I may think of slavery in the abstract, or of the practical injustice to the Free States, of that part of our Constitution of Government which relates to slaves, it is yet in my estimation one portion of a perfect contract to which I am for adhering, both in spirit and in letter. If the question of slavery must come at all, let it come without hastening. I would even go farther, and make every proper exertion to delay it. There can be no doubt which of the parties is least affected by waiting. But if advantage is to be taken of the very instrument which secures our indifference, for the purpose of forcing upon us the adoption of a system of measures perpetuating the evil at the cost of every principle which makes the government dear to us; if the right to think, to write and to speak our opinions in the freest manner, is to be taken away from us, then is the time come for a general stand. This is not a question of party. I attach to none of those as at present known, a positive, distinct responsibility for the acts which I complain of—party lines are obliterated whenever the subject is agitated. The Southern members of every shade of political faith, Nullifiers, Union men, Whigs, Van Buren men and fence-keepers, rest upon the common bond whenever the question is raised, without conceiving themselves guilty of breach of party faith. Why, O, why shall not the citizens of the Free States do the same? They are called upon by every motive which can properly actuate the human mind. Duty—to themselves—to their country—to their God. If it is once settled, that the rule of conduct in national affairs is to uphold the Negro Slavery at the South, at whatever cost, and no confidence is to be placed in any citizen of a free State, unless he shall have submitted himself to every condition required of him, no matter how humiliating, no matter how adverse to the interests and honor of the country, then indeed are the tables turned in a manner our ancestors could hardly have dreamed of. The cause of Freedom is then to become secondary to the cause of Slavery, and our Declaration of Independence is to become a mockery and a show. This will not be submitted to by the honest portion of the Northern States. It is not fair to ask of them that it should be. The violent and ambitious among the slave-holders, have played upon a string in wantonness, which may yet answer to them in sounds of thunder. Let them be wise in time, and not be maliciously confusing together questions having no direct or necessary relation with each other; nor by embarking northern statesmen with unreasonable demands, for the mere purpose of making them odious whichever way they reply, endanger the formation of a conservative organization, which will know no distinction but the SUPPORT OF LIBERTY.

AN INDEPENDENT THINKER.

4. Resolved, That any attempt on the part of the government to lessen, abridge or impair this right, should be promptly, sternly and indignantly rebuked by the people.

5. Resolved, That the Bill, called the "Incendiary Publication Bill," recently passed to be engrossed in the Senate of the United States by the casting vote of the Vice President, is a direct and daring infringement of this right, and is, in the judgment of this meeting, more odious in its principles, and if enacted into a law, would be more dangerous in its consequences to the liberties of the people, than was the Sedition Law, enacted during the presidency of the elder Adams.

Hon. Cyrus Ware, Gen. Walton, Wm. Upham, Esq., Col. Miller, S. B. Prentiss, Esq., F. F. Merrill and C. L. Knapp, severally addressed the meeting.

On motion, Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published.

Adjourned without day.

O. SMITH, Chairman.

C. L. KNAPP, Secretary.

Freedom of Speech.

It does seem that the demoniac spirit of mobocracy and misrule will never cease to disgrace our country. The town of Washington, in this State, has lately signalized its patriotism and love of order, by threatening martyrdom to an individual there who dared to exercise his birth-right—the right of publishing his opinions, freely and fearlessly, in the true spirit of a free-born American. But these things occur daily in the land, until our boasted liberty has become a by-word and hissing. God only knows to what destructive consequences this spirit may lead—for He is the only power that can stay its progress; What is the bondage of the body, when the spirit is manacled? What are iron chains and corporeal sufferings, when the eyes of the soul are bored out—the very thoughts gagged and trodden down! But we now proclaim to all tyrants and haters of those "inalienable rights" set forth in our Declaration, that the freedom of speech and of the press in this country will exist co-extensively with the memory of the hard-fought battles of the days of the revolution. It cannot be awed by numbers—it cannot be appalled by threatenings—it will not shrink before torture—it will not cringe before authority, or fawn at the feet of power or prerogative—it will soar unshackled and victorious, even when the horrid instruments of death glut unslaughtering for its existence.

The "gag-law" lately negatived by the Senate, is another mournful manifestation of the degeneracy of that liberal spirit which has heretofore characterised

that legislative body. When the temple of freedom trembles at its own name—when the very citadel of liberty suicidally throws down the pillars that support this union, our eyes may soon behold the superstructure, now fair, and matchless, and beautiful, prostrate and level with the dust. May this day be distant—but if an open and undisguised contest between tyranny and freedom of speech is to be waged in the very "home of the free," let it come soon—we long for the crisis, that it may be seen how brightly yet burns in our bosoms the same untrammeled spirit that refused to hear the burden of British bondage. We speak it not boastingly—but we believe that we love our country so much, our free institutions, our own rights and immunities, and those of our fellow men, that the hand that traces these lines must be palsied in death ere they submit to be pinioned and bound for a mere expression of opinion—and we feel that this sentiment will be echoed and responded to by multitudes in this land from Maine to the Gulf.

From the Boston Advocate.

Pinckney's Resolution.

To suppose that the passage of two, or three, or a hundred resolutions like those of Mr. Pinckney, will settle any thing beyond the moment, appears to me a great error. The hurried and indecent mode in which they were forced through their passage in the House of Representatives, betrays an utter want of their confidence in their soundness by the majority itself, which voted for them. How then can they stand a scrutiny before the people, where discussion is still free? What one Congress has done in the mere way of expressing opinion, they can order another to revoke—especially when the legitimate powers of the body are believed to have been transcended. The persons who engage to reject petitions without reading, are bound by their engagement, but cannot bind those whom the public may point out to take their places for the purpose of receiving such petitions. What is the amount of the resolve, then, but a mere flash without the power to do injury. The majority of the people may, it is true, ratify it. It is told of Harley, Lord Oxford, Ann's Tory Minister, that when objection was made by some person to a proposed measure, on the ground that the people never would bear it, he replied, "You don't know how far the good people of England will bear." He lived to learn the danger of practicing too extensively upon this maxim. And so will those persons who adopt it in this country. A future Congress will restore the right of petition, so as sure as the people know their rights, and knowing dare maintain them. And the inevitable consequences of thus forcibly joining, against all the dictates of sound sense the right of petition with the abolition of slavery, will only be to give to the latter an appearance of success which it might not otherwise have had. But if superadded upon this, the cause of liberty of speech, so fearfully trampled down to effect the passage of Pinckney's resolution, is also to be invaded, and all the persons who take up the argument in these, are to be forthwith denounced as abolitionists, then should the spirit of the American people be hereafter what it has been, no ghost will be needed to tell us, that before long the abolition cause, thus artificially matured, will be the cause of the great majority in the Free States. Should this result, certainly to be dreaded and deplored, be once brought about, it will then be worse than idle to indulge in crimination and recrimination as to who first set the ball rolling. It will then serve no useful end to attach censure to this, or the other person. *The harm will have been done.* The sincerest repentance will avail nothing in the way of correction. How much better then to desist in time—not to add fuel to the fire by ill-judged electioneering accusations, but by narrowing down the merits of the abolition question to its simplest form and most natural limits, to cut off the chance of evils which once brought out would be found next to impossible to remove.

I hope I have not given occasion for any mistake of my meaning. I am not, myself, an abolitionist, nor disposed to go a step out of my way merely to aid their cause. Whatever I may think of slavery in the abstract, or of the practical injustice to the Free States, of that part of our Constitution of Government which relates to slaves, it is yet in my estimation one portion of a perfect contract to which I am for adhering, both in spirit and in letter. If the question of slavery must come at all, let it come without hastening. I would even go farther, and make every proper exertion to delay it. There can be no doubt which of the parties is least affected by waiting. But if advantage is to be taken of the very instrument which secures our indifference, for the purpose of forcing upon us the adoption of a system of measures perpetuating the evil at the cost of every principle which makes the government dear to us; if the right to think, to write and to speak our opinions in the freest manner, is to be taken away from us, then is the time come for a general stand. This is not a question of party. I attach to none of those as at present known, a positive, distinct responsibility for the acts which I complain of—party lines are obliterated whenever the subject is agitated. The Southern members of every shade of political faith, Nullifiers, Union men, Whigs, Van Buren men and fence-keepers, rest upon the common bond whenever the question is raised, without conceiving themselves guilty of breach of party faith. Why, O, why shall not the citizens of the Free States do the same? They are called upon by every motive which can properly actuate the human mind. Duty—to themselves—to their country—to their God. If it is once settled, that the rule of conduct in national affairs is to uphold the Negro Slavery at the South, at whatever cost, and no confidence is to be placed in any citizen of a free State, unless he shall have submitted himself to every condition required of him, no matter how humiliating, no matter how adverse to the interests and honor of the country, then indeed are the tables turned in a manner our ancestors could hardly have dreamed of. The cause of Freedom is then to become secondary to the cause of Slavery, and our Declaration of Independence is to become a mockery and a show. This will not be submitted to by the honest portion of the Northern States. It is not fair to ask of them that it should be. The violent and ambitious among the slave-holders, have played upon a string in wantonness, which may yet answer to them in sounds of thunder. Let them be wise in time, and not be maliciously confusing together questions having no direct or necessary relation with each other; nor by embarking northern statesmen with unreasonable demands, for the mere purpose of making them odious whichever way they reply, endanger the formation of a conservative organization, which will know no distinction but the SUPPORT OF LIBERTY.

Backing Out.

ANOTHER 'RESPONSE' TO THE SOUTH.—At the May session of the Rhode Island legislature, it was resolved that a committee of five be appointed to consider and report upon the memorials of divers citizens of the state, relating to the subject of free discussion and the liberty of the press, and upon the documents in relation to slavery transmitted to the Governor of the state. A meeting of this committee was advertised in the newspapers of that state to be held at Newport on the 22d June, and public notice was given to the abolition memorialists, and all persons interested in the subject, to appear at the time and place appointed and be heard in the premises. Agreeably to this invitation the abolitionists of Rhode Island appointed a large and able committee to maintain their rights before the legislative committee. But on arriving at Newport, on the 22d, it was found that the courage of the anti-slavery party had like that of Acres "oozed out at their fingers' ends." Benjamin Hazard, their leader, a man, whose character and person are thus quaintly described by the editor of the Pawtucket Record: "His very looks indicate that he is possessed of the devil; and he acts as if he had a legion in him"—this man, who boasted in the town

meeting of Newport; that he would gag every abolitionist in Rhode Island, dared not meet the friends of liberty in free and many discussion. He backed out from the encounter—advocated an indefinite postponement of the whole subject, gag law and all, which was finally agreed to by a majority of the Assembly. The abolition members of the assembly did not spare the drafter of the gag law. They proclaimed the cowardice and the meanness of his conduct, in abusing and shamefully libelling his fellow citizens challenging them to meet him face to face, and then shrinking from the contest and refusing them a hearing.

The Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Society has published a spirited address to the people of Rhode Island, setting forth the injustice of the course pursued by the assembly, in refusing a hearing to the abolitionists. Two great meetings have been held in Providence by the friends of free discussion. The GAG-LAW will never again be revived in Rhode Island. The yeomanry are in motion: knowing their rights, they will fearlessly maintain them standing on the grave of Roger Williams, it is impossible to make them slaves.

'The exiles' home! on every hill
His own free spirit walks abroad—
The children of his blessing still
Kneel unto God!
No fetters on their limbs are worn
Nor yoke upon their shoulders borne;
Unshackled be the winds which play
On their own Narragansett bay!

Haverhill Gazette.

Aristocracy vs. Abolitionism.

THE WASHINGTON U. S. TELEGRAPH.—The editor of this paper is correct in his belief that the Aristocracy of the North are against the abolitionists. Our ranks of abolition are filled with the middling interest men—the mechanics, farmers, and laboring classes. The highest dignitaries of Church and State—the Lords spiritual of Andover, and the Lords temporal of Boston, have joined hands against the friends of emancipation. The divine right of slave-holders, is fully recognised by both. But the abolitionists ask no aid of either. Relying on the power of truth; on the pure democracy of their principles; on the promises of the Bible; on the answer of a good conscience within them, they will go on steadily and surely to the accomplishment of their object, undeterred by threats, unfeigned by flattery. The great question of the right of the laborer, whether white or black, to the fruits of his hard toil, is fully before our people. And does the intelligent editor of the Telegraph dream for a moment that the foundation principle of slavery as defined by Gov. M'Duffie, and Mr. Pickens in Congress, viz. that the *laborer is rightly the property of the capitalist* will find favor among the working men of New-England? Never, never, our Southern friends deceive themselves. The spirit of enquiry which is now abroad on this subject will most certainly result in the entire conviction of the minds of the people of New-England, that slavery in one part of our country is an insult and an injury to the free labor of another; that an attempt to abrogate the eternal laws of God and nature; a deadly poison in the well spring of human liberty and happiness—the evil effects of which are felt by all. *Ibid.*

From the Cleveland Whig.

Refreshing Commentary.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.—We notice that many of the newspapers publish the Declaration of Independence on the return of the anniversary, as an appropriate selection for the time. We are glad to see it. Abundance need is there, as we believe, to republish the truths which that instrument contains, since they have become so true as to lose their proper weight, and like other truisms, are assented to and disregarded: there is need to reprobate them, not as closet truths, abstract and valueless, but as practical principles, unchanging and universal. It is strange indeed that any who assent to the principles of the Declaration should yet oppose their practical adoption. But the fact is so. There are thousands in our country who are ready to reclaim on "the natural and unalienable rights of man;" but if perchance one mentions negro slavery in that connection, they will begin to explain or modify the broad proposition down to something which shall leave that "*exciting topic*" untouched. One will tell you gravely, perhaps, that "all white men are born free and equal," &c., another, that though the proposition is abstractly true, yet the principle must yield to expediency.

We are among those who believe that the only true expediency is obedience to principle, and that political consistency, justice and humanity alike dictate the immediate and practical recognition of the rights of all men in our land.

A. W. Kitchell.

The following is from the Newark Daily Advertiser in reference to Mr. AARON W. KITCHELL, of New-Jersey, who was so shamefully maltreated in Jasper county, Georgia, on the 5th inst., on suspicion of being an abolitionist. It may be that the perpetrators of this outrage may imagine they have performed a brave and creditable exploit. The rest of the world will consider it disgraceful to the community where it occurred.

REMARK.—The individual who has been thus barbarously treated by the citizens of a sister state, is a member of one of the most respectable families in the state of N. Jersey—a graduate of Princeton college—a licentiate of the Theological Seminary, and a young man of distinguished worth—amiable, unassuming, and we hesitate not to believe, UNOFFENDING. We are assured by a friend who has an intimate knowledge of his whole history, that there is nothing obtrusive or offensive in his manners or sentiments on any subject; and moreover, that when he left home a year ago, he was decidedly opposed to the views of the abolitionists as a party.

It is not at all probable, therefore, that he has given any just offence to the people of Georgia, and most certainly could have not just cause for such uncomprehensible inhumanity and savage treatment. What would be the feelings of these high minded Georgians, if the people of New-Jersey were thus lawlessly to abuse a citizen of that State on any pretext whatever?

If an American had been so treated in Mexico, it would have been deemed abundant cause for a call upon the government for the punishment of the offenders; and in truth such a breach of every principle of courtesy and justice on our part, might have made the country ring with cries for separation of the Union. But we forbear for the present, and shall wait for further and more particular information.

Mr. Kitchell, we may remark, is a native of Hanover, in Morris county, and is a grandson of the late Honorable Aaron Kitchell, for many years a distinguished representative in Congress from this state, and subsequently a member of the United States Senate.

From the Haverhill Gazette.

In the face of facts like these what is it but utterly folly to talk of American Liberty and the blessings of our glorious Union! There is no liberty at the South for the black man, and none for the white man who does not bow down in a worse than Manichean devotion to the Moloch of Slavery. What is our Union to the man who loves liberty and detests slavery! In one half of the States of our confederacy he cannot step without exposing himself to shameful outrage or a violent death. Should a citizen of Massachusetts venture to repeat in the streets of Savannah or Norfolk the language of the first article of the Constitution of Massachusetts, his life would be in jeopardy. It is time for the free states, instead of responding to the impudent resolutions of Southern legislatures in a spirit of miserable servility, to utter in the ears of the South their determination to extend the *egis* of their sovereignty and protection over their citizens whose business calls them abroad; and to hold the people of South Carolina and Georgia to the letter of the Constitutional compact. The Union cost too much blood and treasure to be thus practically sundered and broken up by lawless Lynch-clubs. We submit the remarks of two of our contemporaries on the outrage above described:

From the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser.

The Newark Advertiser says that he is "a member of one of the most respectable families in the state of New Jersey; a graduate of Princeton College; a licentiate of the Theological Seminary, and a young man of distinguished worth, amiable, unassuming, and we hesitate not to believe, UNOFFENDING."

And we now would inquire—is there no remedy for these outrages? Can nothing be done to arrest them? In the proud days of the Roman Republic, had such an outrage been committed upon a Roman citizen, in any part of the world, the wrong would have been redressed, or the world would have trembled beneath the tread of her legions. "Is it lawful," said the great apostle of the Gentiles, when in one of his perils—"is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?" What an instantaneous change did those magical words produce in the conduct of his persecutors! Their high bearing was at once changed to *entreaty*. And shall American citizenship afford an *egis* so thin that "a pigmy straws may pierce it?" We should think the case one deserving the attention of the Governor of New Jersey. Let him demand the interposition of the Executive and civil authorities of Georgia.

PALLIADUM OF OUR RIGHTS.

JAMES C. LUDLOW,
REES E. PRICE,
JAMES G. BIRNEY,
ISAAC COLBY,
WM. DONALDSON,
JOHN MELENDY,
G. BAILEY,
THOMAS MAYLIN,
C. DONALDSON.

July 18th, 1836.

Executive Committee of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society.

"The Working Man's Friend."

teness rebuke our slave-holding brethren, and it will be but a short time, before we shall see the stain of slavery washed out from her fair banners, and the truth of God triumphant over this evil:

"At a meeting on the 11th day of July, 1836, of the members of the Presbyterian church, in New Richmond, Clermont county, and state of Ohio, Mr. Dan Davis was chosen Moderator, and Robert Porter Clerk, the following Preamble and Resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"According to the preliminary principles laid down in our Book of Discipline, 'the rights of private judgment in all matters that respect religion, is universal and unalienable. That in perfect consistency with the above principle of common right, every church, or union, or association of particular churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its communion, and the qualifications of its ministers and members, as well as the whole system of its internal government, which Christ hath appointed.'

"Therefore, believing it right for any church or society, to declare the terms of communion and fellowship of such membership. And, having come to the conclusion, from the word of God, and the universal consciousness of all mankind, that selling and buying and owning men, women, and children, as property, is unjust and unchristian, and a horrid violation of the commands of the Lord our God, who requires all men to do justly and to love mercy, and to deny all ungodliness and unrighteousness.—And, that to make a genuine profession of religion, it is required to give up, immediately, all known sin, as the only test of our regeneration and obedience.

"Therefore, we do solemnly entreat our sister churches, in the United States, who may be living in the sin of slave-holding, to put the evil away from among them, without delay; that they may become what God requires of them to be, a holy people, and zealous of good works; and not to live any longer to follow the example of poor barbarous Africa, in making slaves of their fellow-men. (For G! it's a shame for such a thing to be named amongst us, that a single christian, in the United States of America should own a slave.)

"Therefore, Resolved, That this church, hereafter debars all persons from her communion, who are guilty of holding men, women, or children as property, or who advocate the system. That we shall cordially receive, with open arms and christian regard, those churches who may repent and forsake the above practice.

"Resolved, That the above preamble and resolutions be recorded in the Session Book, and duly enforced by the Session.

"Resolved, That the foregoing preamble and resolutions be published in the Cincinnati Journal and Luminary and the Philanthropist.

DAN DAVIS, Moderator.

A true copy ROBERT PORTER, Clerk."

MARCH OF MIND.

On Friday morning last, I went to the Franklin House to board, during the absence of Mrs. Birney in Kentucky, whether she had gone, to visit our relatives, and spend a few weeks for the benefit of her greatly impaired health. I went to the Franklin House, because, on former occasions I had boarded there—because, on my removal to Cincinnati, for nearly a week, my large family had been comfortably accommodated at the Franklin House—and because I regarded Col. Johnson, the proprietor, and his lady, with no small share of personal respect.—Sometime during Friday, as I have been informed, a convocation of all the boarders, about fifty in number, was called—to assemble after tea, to take into consideration the propriety of petitioning Col. Johnson to request me to leave the house. The letter below was the fruit of the incubation. It had seventeen names attached to it, among these was that of a lad about fifteen years old, as we are informed—the name of a gentleman, also, who was absent, was put down by one of the signers, who, doubtless, thinks such a liberty is included in the prerogative of friend ship. These gentlemen, I have been told, are generally employed as clerks in the neighboring stores, and were among the youngest of the boarders. One of them—perhaps the eldest on the list—is (as I also am) a member of the Presbyterian church. He is from Kentucky, and his father a slave-holder in that state. Here is the letter, verbatim et literatim, et punctuatim:

WILLIAM JOHNSON, Esq.

WE the undersigned, Boarders, of the Franklin House, Herby respectfully, Petition, you, as proprietor of said House; to Inform, Mr. Birney, the abolitionist; by letter or otherwise, that his remaining as a Boarder of said House! Will be against the wishes & feelings of a large Majority of your Boarders! And that you request him, to Leave forthwith.—And should you deem it fit to permit him to stay knowing it to be against our wishes! — We shall from the strongest sense of duty! procure a residence, far more congenial, and, compatible to our feelings.—

Cincinnati, July 15. 1836

After the first emotion of indignation which such conduct on the part of young men, who, so far as age is concerned, might be my sons, was fitted to excite, I looked on the proceeding as so supremely ridiculous, that I gave myself no concern about it. Twelve of the sixteen, who signed the letter, have left Col. J.'s. Their places have been nearly, if not entirely filled up, by new boarders. I forbear publishing the names that were attached to the letter, believing that the most considerate of them will, on reflection, regret what they have done. It may gain them no small reward of praise among the slave-holders of the South—but, surely, such conduct towards one against whom no violation of any of the properties of social intercourse was alleged, cannot receive the approbation of the freemen of the North—they will be slow to believe, that any one should be publicly insulted, merely because he thinks with our revolutionary fathers, that all men are created free and equal, and entitled to their lives and their liberty, and undertakes, in the midst of an opposition confessedly mercenary to say so.

THE LATE OUTRAGE ON THE PRESS.

We are beginning to hear from different parts of the country, of the effect this has produced on the public mind. Whilst we deplore all violence—whilst we sorrow to see any of our citizens give themselves up to the sway of the most pernicious passions—yet we entertain no doubt, that every act of lawless violence gives fresh impulse to the cause of freedom in which we are engaged. The accounts we have already received, represent the people in the country, as indignant at the late assault on the liberty of the press. How confident sooner the friends of slavery among us may be,—of one thing they may rest assured, that the people—the farmers—the industrious mechanics—the tradesmen—in fine, the working men of the country, will not bear to see their own safeguard, the press overthrown by any set of men, no matter how wealthy or respectable they may be. Of one thing we are sure—should the fury of those who have already committed an act that has disgraced the city, impel them to a repetition of it—should they even succeed in utterly demolishing the press in our service, it will not for one moment check the progress of liberal principles—and in the end, the Philanthropist will be re-established more firmly than ever.

EFFORTS TO RAISE A MOB.

From the Cin. Whig and Com. Intelligencer.

MR. EDITOR:—Allow me to ask the people of Cincinnati (I mean those really interested in her prosperity,) through the medium of your paper, if they do not intend at this time, now, to give so decided an expression of their sentiments as regards abolition, that those who are injuring the character and prospects of this city, may know and feel that this is not the place for them.

Will they permit a band of fanatics, led on by an English emissary, to make this city the theatre of their operation, from whence they may throw firebrands in the slave States, that will kindle a fire, that will not be quenched till this glorious Union shall be dissolved, and the blood of the innocent—of women and children—cry for vengeance?

This same journal, when a citizen of Ohio was publicly and cruelly whipped, like a slave in the Square of Nashville—and this without having violated any law, as the flagellators themselves acknowledged—this same Editor rejoiced at it, and declared that the punishment seemed to give universal satisfaction. What better could be expected of one who could rejoice at an enormity like this, than that he should publish exhortations to all who, like himself, have no real love of liberty, that they should join together to trample it under foot. If this Press were owned in a Slave State, it could not be more zealous than it has shown itself to be in its attacks on the safety, and the freedom of our own citizens.

From the Cin. Republican of July 21.

A WORD OF ADVICE TO MESSRS. LUDLOW, PRICE, DONALDSON, &c.—Publish no more cards or addresses about midnight invasions. Eschew the society of James G. Birney. Avoid him as you would a viper. Mind your affairs. Consult your own interests and the interests of the community from whom you are deriving a support, and from whom some of you have acquired fortunes. If any of you are foreigners we would advise you most especially to be silent on the subject of slavery. A large majority of our citizens have taken the foolish notion into their heads that they understand their own institutions and their own interests quite as well as certain foreign dictators. Verbum sat.

We have said it before, and now repeat it, that it is the violence and abuse indulged in by the Press, that has raised up every mob by which any of our cities have been disgraced. The embittered—the relentless persecution with which a large portion of the Cincinnati Press has followed the Editor of the Philanthropist, is truly astonishing for this age of the world. Had some of its conductors lived two hundred years ago, during the times of witchcraft and persecution, they would have drowned many an old dame, charged with caring through the air on a broomstick: or if in the still darker times of the Inquisition, they might justly have aspired to the distinction of Chief Tormentors.

A third of this species, but of stature too small to be more particularly mentioned, but who still keeps firing his mischievous pop-gun, had the hardihood, at the commencement of the reign of terror in the South, to advise the people of this city to establish it here, and to Lynch their own neighbors. All this, too, in the free State of Ohio—in its metropolis, claiming the title of Queen of the West—with a church for every thousand of its population—with her noble and numerous edifices for republican education! Surely, Southern slavery has in it some excellency, which more than forty years' connexion with it has not enabled us to discover—or its perpetuation would not be demanded at the sacrifice of all the rich jewelry of freedom.

THE ASSAILANTS OF THE PRESS AND OF FREE DISCUSSION.—What do they say? They allege that a vital stab is given by the friends of freedom to the prosperity of this city. That if we talk of "Southern institutions," the slave-holders will get out of humor with us, and cut our intercourse.—What if they do? Can we not live without them? Are we beggars, at their mercy? Is all the benefit of the intercourse on our side? Must we degrade, and vilify, and persecute our own citizens, that we may fill our hotels and boarding-houses with our Southern neighbors, and their retinues of slaves?—Must we trample on the liberty of white men here, because they have trampled on the liberty of black men at the South? Must we forge chains for the mind here, because they have forged them for the body there? Must we extinguish the right to speak, the right to print in the North, that we may be in union with the South? No, never.

Slave emancipation, in itself, has become a matter of comparatively small moment. The aristocracy among us, are thrusting with deadly aim at the very life of our liberties. Take away the freedom of speech and of the press, and where is the hope of redressing any abuse or resisting any usurpation? None. The abuses already existing, will be multiplied and enlarged—they will be inveterated—and in the new Free States, the poor will be reduced to the degradation of Russian boors and serfs. Let every man, then, who places any value on the blessings of liberty, such as our fathers intended to establish for us, and for our offspring, be up and doing in this matter.

But where is the proof, that the prosperity of Cincinnati has received a vital stab? When before has her commercial business been so great at this season of the year, as it is now? No one can remember when it has been more prosperous. Enquire of the steam-boat builders—they have more orders than they can fill. Go to the working men of all trades—they are all employed at an advance on former prices. Ask the house owners—never have rents been so high, or houses for rent so scarce.—

Ask for accommodation at a Hotel—it is almost a favor to obtain a bed to sleep in, they are so crowded to overflowing. Ask, in a word, any man who has known Cincinnati for years, and he will tell you that its state has never been more flourishing.

Now, what is the CONTRA of all this? A few speculators in the produce of the country—in its virtues—in its very staff of life, have overshot the mark—their Pork is DULL, and their Flour is SOURING on their hands. Here is the proof that the prosperity of our city has received its vital stab.

A FUGITIVE FROM JUSTICE!

\$100 REWARD.

The above sum will be paid for the delivery of the body of one James G. Birney, a fugitive from justice, now in the city of Cincinnati. Said Birney in all his associations and feelings is black; although his external appearance is white. The reward will be paid, and no questions asked by

OLD KENTUCKY.

The foregoing is a copy of a Handbill, transmitted to the editor through the Post Office, in a blank envelope, and stuck up on the corners of the streets in Cincinnati. It is part of the scheme now in operation to put down the freedom of the press and of speech in Ohio, that we may have favor with our "Southern neighbors." If this document is of slave-holding manufacture, there is not a citizen of Ohio who should not feel indignant at the outrage. It is enough for our neighboring slave-holders, we should think, that they are permitted to advertise and arrest among us their runaway slaves—but too much, entirely, when they take to themselves the liberty of advertising rewards for the abduction of our own citizens.

If on the other hand, it is of Cincinnati manufacture, it is proof, by no means contemptible, of the malignant influence that Slavery is exerting over all our notions of liberty. What would be said if governor McDuffie should be invincibly signalized by an advertisement stuck up in this city, offering a reward for his delivery here, because he publicly insulted the state of Ohio, by advising her to establish slavery as a domestic institution? It would be viewed as it ought to be—it would be countenanced by none but the lawless and disorderly. Yet, is there no insult which slaveholders themselves, or their upholders here can heap upon us, that is thought too heavy for our patient endurance.

INCENDIARISM.

The following note was privately deposited in the scales of a respectable and industrious tradesman of Cincinnati, on the morning of the 15th inst.

CINCINNATI, July 14, 1836.
Sir,—It is said that you profess friendship to the cause of abolition. We wish you immediately upon the receipt of this to put your answer in your window so that one of many may see it, and report the same. The simple word Yes, or No, will suffice. Be sure you comply immediately.

ANTI-ABOLITION.

MA.

PRESIDENT.

We do not give the name of the person to whom it was directed, but any one can have it by enquiring at the office of the Philanthropist. The menace conveyed in this letter was disregarded, of course, as it ought to have been.—We have but one remark to make on this attempt:—If slavery is to be continued by such dark and assassin-like attempts against the peace and safety of our own citizens and their families, the sooner it is brought to an end the better. That any one among us should desire to see it continued by such dark espionage proves that he has no love for liberty or law.

CORRECTION.

We very cheerfully republish the following explanation from the Ohio State Journal, attached to an article originally published in the Philanthropist. It would have been done earlier had the paper been earlier sent to us.

Our article was penned from information given us by a gentleman residing in Columbus, who, doubtless will be pleased to see the error, (if it be one) into which he has innocently led us, corrected. If that gentleman should see this, we will be glad to hear from him on the subject. Let justice be done.

MORE OF IT.

THE SPIRIT OF SEVENTY-SIX, a thorough going Nullification print, maintaining doctrines that are believed by nearly all the most intelligent and patriotic men in the country, to involve necessarily, a dissolution of the Union, has recently been established at Columbus. It has been treated as it ought to be. No one thinks of mobbing or disturbing it, or of preventing it from throwing before the community its peculiar doctrines. Yet from the office of this very paper was issued the following Pasquade; and by its carrier was it distributed among the citizens, and stuck up on the corners of the streets.

Truly, this was an insult that ought to have been felt by every citizen of Columbus—when offered by any man—but most of all by one, who is disseminating doctrines that have been transplanted from the very hot bed of oppression.—Cincinnati Phil.

TO ABOLITIONISTS.

Understanding that an individual contemplates delivering a Lecture this evening, at the Court House in this City, upon the subject of Abolition, andility, and perfidy, and persecute our own citizens, that we may fill our hotels and boarding-houses with our Southern neighbors, and their retinues of slaves.

It is known, have been printed at the same place, and distributed by the same person—a very worthy man, by the way, who is the common carrier of several printing establishments in this city. But as the Editor of the Spirit of Seventy-Six had in reality no agency whatever, in circulating the publication which has given offence to the Editor of the Philanthropist, we trust that the latter will hasten to correct the error into which he has fallen.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF SLAVES.

A correspondent of the Church Advocate, published at Lexington, Ky., uses the following language, in relation to the blacks of that state:

"The poor negroes are left in the ways of spiritual darkness, no efforts are being made for their enlightenment, no seed is being sown in this portion of our Lord's vineyard.—Here nothing but a moral wilderness is seen, over which the soul sickens—the heart of Christian sympathy bleeds. Here nothing is presented but a moral waste, as extensive as our influence, as appalling as the valley of death to the unrepentant, conscience stricken sinner."

Now, why all this complaining, when hundreds of these same blacks are held in bondage by the members of that very church, through whose organ this complaint is furnished—and when in Kentucky, there is actually no substantial obstacle to a full and thorough emancipation of every slave they hold in bonds. Let the church do its duty, purge herself of the sin of oppression. Till then there can be neither sincerity nor dignity in her complaints.

Texas Insurrection.

We publish to-day, the first of a series of able numbers on this subject, originally published in the "National Gazette." The whole, which we have just read with great satisfaction, furnishes an admirable and impartial view of the causes which have led to the present state of affairs in Texas. It is comprised in a pamphlet of 32 pages, and for sale at the Anti-Slavery Depository—price 12 cents.

From the Cincinnati Whig and Intelligencer.

Abolition and Mobism.

A republican government differs from a despotic in this—that in the former every citizen has a right to participate in making the laws by which he is to be governed, whereas in the latter, the will of one man or a few men, is the paramount source of power. William Wirt asserted, four years ago, that this government was a government of laws.—It was at that time—it is so now? Recent demonstrations, which have filled patriotic breasts with alarm, seem to prove otherwise. Lawless assemblies of people have trampled the laws under foot, in order to carry out their wicked intentions. This is the very essence of tyranny. It is the most threatening cloud in the horizon of the future, and forebodes the time as not very remote, when a sickening shadow shall fall upon our country. The wild and fearful outbreaks of popular tumult, consigned Athens to her gloomy destiny, and eclipsed the glory of Rome in a night of despotism. Like causes, produce like effects—and what was truth in Athens and Rome, may be truth in our country.

It was hoped that the respect which Americans entertained for those institutions, under whose influential guidance the nation was making rapid strides onward to glory and posterity, would forever check that mad and incendiary spirit which, in the old world and in former times, brought desolation on the most favored state. In our common country, we believe that there is sufficient patriotism and genuine love of independence yet alive to save the Commonwealth. Is Cincinnati an exception? Is its influence on the side of Law, or on the side of Despotism? There have of late been some fearful intimations of a spirit which would desecrate the Temple of Liberty, and invade the rights which our fathers purchased with their blood and treasure.—We believe, however, that there still exists in our city, an arm strong enough to arrest the fanatical and reckless spirit of mobism, and to see that the majesty of Law receive no violation. Shall that arm be stayed, while insubordination and anarchy are hurling their threats upon us? Or will not rather every good citizen at once exert his influence on the side of Liberty and Law.

During the present week, a mob has made forcible entry on, and destroyed private property. And now a handbill stares us in the face, threatening vengeance on all who dare to maintain rights which their Creator gave them, and which our State Constitution guarantees to all its citizens. Are a majority of Cincinnatians so careless of their rights, as to regard with supineness a project for establishing Lynch law on the ruins of State law? If a few misguided Abolitionists are the first on whom the vengeance of mobocracy is to fall, how long will it be before that same insatiable spirit will call for fresh victims? And who will be safe?

Those who know enough of human nature and of its history, will be careful how they give a body which they oppose reason to cry out persecution against them. They know that one act of lawlessness will do more to strengthen the hands of their opponents than their own exertions could possibly do. If Abolitionism is to be put down, such will never resort to physical force, in order to accomplish their purpose. For they are aware that mobs against abolitionism will throw the sympathies of the better portion of the community upon their side, and where the sympathies of men are, but little is wanting to place their strength there also. If my hopes and prospects depended on the success of abolition measures, I would rejoice at the impolicy of my opponents who should attempt to put it down by mobs. How is it in those cities in which anti-abolitionists have taken place—in New York, Boston and Utica? Why the simple fact is, that in each of those places abolitionists took a fresh start from oppression, and the mobs accomplished more for it, than all the Tappans, Garrisons, Thompsons, et al omni hoc genus, together. Utica in particular where mobism assumed the most terrible character, has been completely abolished, and those who got up the incendiary mobs regret exceedingly, now when it is too late, that they were so unwise as to attempt to put down abolition by the strong arm of popular feeling.

Slavery is a subject which is amenable to enlightened reason and judgment, and to be understood and appreciated it must be examined and discussed. He who is not afraid of the truth, will have no objections to this examination; and he who is not a bigot to error, and is not a tyrant at heart, will never interfere with the right which in this country every man has to discuss any subject which he pleases. You may put down abolition with the weapons of reason and persuasion, perhaps, but you can never do it by the threats of mobs.

The writer of this, is no abolitionist, but like thousands of his fellow citizens, rather than see mobocracy triumph, he would choose the success of abolitionism—believing, as he does, that it were better that abolitionism should govern the country, than that mobs should obliterate the rights, which those patriots who achieved the war of Independence, thought they had forever secured to this country.

The following is also from the Cincinnati Whig, of the 19th. All comment on it is unnecessary. We can only express our surprise, that any man in this community would have the hardihood to write for publication, and any editor so much pliancy as to give publication to, an essay which openly recommends a total contempt of all laws of the land—an utter prostration of every safeguard of individual liberty. Cen slavery be so good a thing, that the sacrifice of all the institutions of liberty is not too much to offer for its continuance.

<

POETRY.

[From the Bangor Mechanic and Farmer.]
—“to undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke!”—Scripture.

Oh, Christian, stop! for the wounded hare

Is panting by thy side,
And I saw him seek a shelter there,

Where the deep blue violets hide.

And the Christian flew to the gushing brook,
For a healing tree was there;
And a Gilead balm from his flowing cup
He poured to the wounded hare.

And the hare awoke, for he felt the charm
That returned his life again;
And he haled his lip from the Gilead balm,
Then bounded over the plain.

But the Christian paused—for a mourning Dove
Came down from the mountain tree,
And she chanted a voiceless tale of love
In a strain of melody.

And the Christian sought the gentle one
That the mountain mourned wailed,
Then listened awhile to her joyful tone,
As through the blue air she sailed.

For he snatched the Dove from a cruel fate,
He unloosed the falcon's grasp,
And bore him triumphantly back to his mate,
Though the death-bird had chained him fast.

Then the Christian bethought him to turn again
To the bloomings of Zion's hill,
And wait till the star should shine over the plain,
For the night was dark and chill.

But he saw a man on the dewy sod,
With a dim and haggard eye,
And he raised his voice and wept aloud
As the Christian passed him by.

Then a voice came down from the ether cloud,
Unloose every captive's chain!
But he heard it not, though it echoed loud
From the mountain back to the plain!

He passed him by, and scorned him too!
For the sun in his fiercest glow,
Had given his visage the storm-cloud's hue,
And had stamped a curse on his brow.

And the stranger turned to the captive's God,
And a tear roll'd down from his eye,
But he saw a cloud in the Christian's road,
While a rainbow gemm'd the sky.

Then a voice came out from the beauteous bow,
As over the waters it hung,
'Fear not, but trust in my covenant now,
For I've heard thy voice, my Son!

And the dark one knelt by the water's side,
And he sang with a joyful tune,
'O thou art my Father, my Friend and my Guide,
Through the paths of this wilderness lone.'

And the Christian was far—but the cloud still hung,
And deeper its blackness grew,
And he heard a voice, like the water's tone
In its rushing to and fro.

It said, 'I have watch'd thee with anxious care;
Thou hast prov'd a changeless love—
And I saw thee up raise the wounded hare,
And restore the wandering dove.'

'But thy Brother kneel'd with a fetter'd hand,
And I bade thee unloose his chain,
But alas! for thy scorning to break that band,
Though his brow wears a darker stain.'

Oh stop, Christian, stop!—tis not the hate,
Nor a dove from the mountain tree,
But thy Brother is fainting and perishing there,
And he raises his hands to thee.

MARY.

Texas Insurrection.

No. I.

The following review of the origin and causes of the Texas Insurrection, which now seems to threaten even the tranquility of the United States, was originally published in the Philadelphia “National Gazette,” in a series of Numbers, over the signature of “COLUMBUS.” The subject to which they refer, is one of vital importance to the cause of Liberty and Human Rights, and merits the attention of every true patriot and Christian republican.

Mr. EDITOR:

Having observed an editorial article in the Gazette of the 13th inst., requesting information relative to the cause of the present insurrection in Texas, I propose to submit some facts to the consideration of the public, through the medium of your columns, which may enable our citizens to form an estimate of the merits of the controversy in question.

In the first place, I will give a brief historical sketch of the colonization or settlement of that section of the Mexican Republic, by the Anglo-Americans, with certain proceedings of the settlers connected with the affairs of government. Secondly—the “Declaration of Independence,” recently promulgated by the Convention in Texas, will be concisely reviewed, and some of its gross errors exposed. Many incidental circumstances will be noticed in the course of my observations; tending to unfold and illustrate the policy of the colonists, and the prime causes of their hostility to the authorities of the Republic.

The writer of this has been an attentive observer of the course of events, relative to the colonization of Texas, for a period of more than fifteen years; and the statements which he now presents to the public, are principally based on personal investigation and documentary evidence.

In reviewing the history of colonization in Texas by Anglo-Americans, it will appear that the first regular plan adopted, was the privilege granted to Moses Austin, of Missouri, by the Spanish authorities, in the year 1820. Previous to that date, a few persons from the United States had temporarily established themselves in the eastern parts of the Province, as Indian traders and unauthorized adventurers. A large tract of country was marked out on the map, and Austin was invested with the privilege of introducing three hundred families of industrious, orderly settlers, professing the Catholic religion, within a given time. When he had obtained this grant, or privilege, he returned to Missouri, and proceeded to make the necessary preparations for carrying his colonial enterprise into effect. Before completing his arrangements, however, Mr. Austin suddenly died—and his son, Stephen F. Austin, took the business in his hands, as the legal heir and representative of his father. He soon repaired to Texas, with a considerable number of settlers, the most of whom emigrated from the States of Tennessee, Missouri, and Louisiana. But prior to his obtaining legal possession, or effecting the settlement of the families who accompanied him, the revolution occurred, which annulled the authority of the government, and resulted in the separation of all the Mexican Provinces from the Spanish Crown. The circumstance here referred to, rendered it necessary for Austin to apply to the new Government for a confirmation of his father's grant. This was obtained with little difficulty, in a modified form, and both the contractor and settlers were liberally supplied with lands, gratis, on the condition of occupying

them and pledging themselves to be obedient to the laws of the country: yet the settlement of the colony was still restricted and confined to persons of the Catholic persuasion.

During the brief reign of the Emperor Iturbide, and the succeeding administration of the Federal Government, Austin proceeded with the settlement of his colony, under the same regulation as before, and procured an extension of privilege to introduce settlers in other parts of Texas. Laws were enacted by the Federal Government, regulating the terms and plans of colonization;—and when the provinces of Coahuila and Texas were united under a State Government, special regulations were made, by the legislature, in conformity with those of the general Congress, all of which were submitted to by the colonists, and binding on them. The settlements rapidly progressed, (the terms being extremely liberal,) and Austin succeeded in fulfilling his contracts with the government, relative to the introduction of the number of settlers for which he had stipulated—receiving the fee simple of large tracts of land as a reward for his trouble.

The spirit of enterprise, adventure, and speculation was now aroused; and divers other persons obtained grants, (the privilege of introducing settlers,) with a view of colonizing the remaining vacant lands in Texas. The most prominent “empresarios” (contractors) were Zavala and Filisola, of Mexico; De Witt, of Missouri; Ross and Leftwich, of Tennessee; Milam, of Kentucky; Burnet, of Ohio; Thorn, of New York; Wavel and Beales, of England; Cameron, of Scotland; Veblen, of Germany; M'Mullen, Powers, and Hewiton, of Ireland. All these entered into contracts with the government upon the same principles that Austin had done. None of them, however, have succeeded in fulfilling their contracts, except De Witt, and Powers & Hewiton. Some of the others have introduced a part of their settlers; but the most have disposed of their “grants” to joint stock companies, organised for the purpose, in New York and Nashville. These companies are extensively engaged in speculating with said “stock,” (and “scrip,” which they pass off as preparatory titles to land,) among the credulous, the ignorant, and the unsuspecting, wherever they can find such willing to purchase. In no age or nation, perhaps, have unauthorized and illegal speculations in lands been carried to such extremes as in Texas, within the period of a few years past. The swindling operations in the Yazoo land speculations of Mississippi, were mere child's play in comparison. The government has thus been defrauded, and its liberal munificence abused, by the overweening and reckless spirit of avaricious adventurers. As I have before said, the terms offered by the government, to bona fide settlers, were of the most liberal nature throughout. They were not only authorized to select large tracts of land, and hold the same, in fee simple, on condition of settlement,—but they were also permitted to introduce all articles necessary for their own accommodation, for the space of ten years, free of the costly duties paid by citizens of the Republic. This, indeed, opened a wide door for smuggling goods into the country, to supply the Indian traders, as well as the native inhabitants. The colonists did not fail to improve the opportunity; and many foreigners took lands, professedly with the view of settlement, and engaged extensively in this illicit traffic. Contraband articles—such as arms, ammunition, &c. for the savage tribes—were introduced in great quantities whenever the vigilance of the government revenue officers could be eluded. Slaves were likewise taken in and held, in violation of the constitution and laws of the State, and the decrees of the General Government.

In this state of things, propositions were made by the government of the United States to that of Mexico, for the purchase of the Texas country, with a view of incorporating it into this Union. The overture was instantly rejected by the Mexican authorities, as they neither possessed the inclination nor the constitutional power to alienate any portion of the territory of the Republic. Many of the newspapers in the United States now teemed with essays and remarks, tending to urge the acquisition of Texas as by any practicable means; and the agent of the government was charged with intriguing for the purpose at the Mexican capital. The idea was also held out by the colonists, that the laws prohibiting the introduction of slaves could be easily evaded, and that they would soon be strong enough to declare and enforce the perpetuation of slavery (although it was abolished by the general and state governments) in that part of the country. The emigration from the slaveholding States to Texas was thus accelerated, in the hope of eventually accomplishing this object. In order to counteract these efforts, the operations of the colonization system were suspended by law in the year 1830. A few troops were then sent to Texas, in addition to a small number previously stationed there, to prevent the illicit and contraband trade, the introduction of slaves, and enforce obedience to the laws generally; but their number were insufficient for the purpose; and the regulations of the government were daringly and continually violated with impunity.

About the beginning of the year 1832, a revolution commenced in the administration of the general government of Mexico. In the course of the ensuing summer, it was consummated so far as the state of Coahuila and Texas was immediately interested, and the government troops were all compelled to leave the colonies. The foreign settlers and traders united with the party opposed to the administration, in this case; and when the troops were expelled, the custom houses were all closed in that portion of Texas which was principally inhabited by foreigners. Nothing was then in their way, to hinder them from evading every law which they chose to disregard, and many of them expressed their determination to suffer no more government troops to be stationed there in future, if they should be enabled to prevent it, under any Mexican administration. For some length of time thereafter, the political affairs of the Republic were unsettled, and the colonists in Texas were permitted to pursue their own course, subject only to the civil authority of the State. This they needed no further than it suited their whims or their interests; and the laws, forbidding the introduction of slaves, the trade with the Indians in arms, &c., and the swindling speculations in land, were considered by them as mere blank leaves in the statute book.

The emigration from the United States to Texas

* There were several others, who obtained “grants” from the State. Grant & Beales and Soto & Egerton, were the number; but theirs were located in Coahuila.

† Sundry “grants” were also made, by the General Government of Mexico, to various persons in the Territory of Santa Fe. These were, Dominguez, Wilson and Everett, Royall & Beales, and Chambers. A large portion of the “grants” made to these persons, as well as those in Coahuila, have been transferred to the companies, aforesaid, in New York—not a settler having been placed upon any of them, except that of Grant & Beales, in Coahuila—and a very few have settled there.

+ A pamphlet was published in the United States, a year or two since, which, speaking of the inhabitants of Texas says—“They are perfectly free, and content with their conditions; they desire no better. It is a free republic, like that of the United States; the people choose their own rulers and make their own laws, and those laws exempt them (the colonists) from dues on all imported goods for their own use, and from taxes for the support of the government, for ten years from their settlement. What more can they desire? And if they did, we know not to what government they can look with a prospect of obtaining it.” The Arkansas Gazette, in 1830, also held forth this language—“Perhaps no hopes can be entertained of acquiring Texas until the people (meaning the colonists) shall throw off the yoke of the Mexican government, which they will no doubt do as soon as they shall have a reasonable pretext for so doing. At present, the Texans are probably subject to as few exacting or onerous as any people under the sun. Their lands are given to them, and they are exempt from taxes of every description; and enjoy many other privileges which they

continued to increase, notwithstanding the prohibition by law; and soon after the expulsion of the troops as above mentioned, the colonists prepared to apply for admission into the Mexican Confederacy, as an “Independent State,” separate from Coahuila.

Spirit of Freedom.

THE RESPONSE OF THE NORTH.—Most of our readers are aware that, at the recent sessions of the Legislatures of the non-slave-holding states, with the annual messages of their Governors, have been transmitted sundry resolutions and reports, and messages from Southern Legislatures and Governors, calling on the former to pass laws to prohibit the discussion of the subject of slavery—the formation of Anti-Slavery associations, and the publication and circulation of Anti-Slavery periodicals. These grave demands have been duly considered, commuted and reported upon, and in some instances discussed. The result is before the public. Let us see what kind of a response has been given to the South.

In Vermont, Gov. Jenison did not recommend a gag law for Abolitionists, for the plain reason that Gov. Jenison is himself a Vice-President of an Abolition Society. Even if it had been otherwise, any such recommendation would have been spurned from the state house of Montpelier, as a gross insult to the iron-nerved, and hard-handed yeomanry of the Green Mountains. Slavery has nothing to hope for from Vermont.

The Legislature of Connecticut has recently adjourned. Certain resolutions were passed, disapproving of Abolitionism and against the agitation of the delicate subject—and there the matter ended.

Gov. Marcy of New York devoted about half of his message to the subject. He was willing even to have a gag-law, if by so doing he could save the vote of the South for his favorite candidate. The legislature adjourned a few weeks ago and sent to the South, not a law—but a resolution implying that there was no need of such a law. The abolitionists had mobbed at Utica, and the fund of two hundred dollars had been taken from their seminary, the Oneida Institute; and therefore they were politely requested to consider themselves dead, until after the fall elections, and the South was invited to attend the funeral. The governor's friend, Mr. Beardsley, assured his Southern friends on the floor of Congress, that the abolitionists were completely annihilated—in that Utica, his place of residence, there was not one to be found—least of all in the Democratic party. Unfortunate Samuel Beardsley!—The mail, a few evenings after, brought him an abolition manifesto signed by 1200 of the inhabitants of Utica—democrats and all! Well might he exclaim:—

—“The time has been
That when the brains were out the man has died.
—What may this mean,
That thou, pale corpse, again revisest
The glimpses of the moon.”

In Maine, the governor did not even allude to the resolutions and demands of his gubernatorial brethren of the South. The legislature passed certain resolutions stating that as abolition was dead and gone, it would be unwise to meddle with it. These resolutions omitted to mention that a state Anti-Slavery society, with thirty or forty auxiliary societies, was in active operation.

In Pennsylvania, the committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the Southern memorials and resolutions, reported, instead of a gag-law, sundry resolutions denying the right of southern legislatures to dictate laws to the freemen of Pennsylvania!

In New Hampshire, Gov. Hill inflicted upon the abolitionists two columns of stale, flat, and unprofitable rebuke. At the session of the legislature which has just

assembled, a committee on the subject was appointed, the chairman of which drew up a pro-slavery report, in the true McDuffie style, and submitted it to his colleagues. Three or four old fashioned farmers who were on the committee refused to sanction it; and on the hands of its author, like Shakespeare's Cardinal, “It died and made no sign.”

In Massachusetts, we all know the fate of Gov. Everett's threat of ‘prosecution at common law’ and of senator Lunt's resolutions. They withered beneath the rebuke of an insulted people. The legislature was not wholly made up of that class of merchants, who, as Ranoul of Gloucester said, with as much truth as severity, during the discussion, ‘would pass any resolutions whatever on the subject, if they only saw a bale of cotton attached to them.’ They permitted the resolutions to go down to the tomb of the Capulets' ‘unhonest,’ but as Senator Lunt is a poet, we hope, not ‘unseeing.’

The South may now exclaim with Falstaff, ‘call you this barking your friends!—a plague on such barking.’ Its threats and demands have had just about as much effect upon the *Legislature* of the free states, as Balmain's whale pistol had upon the rock of Stirling. For the attainment of a political object, some of our politicians have been carefully feeling the public pulse, to ascertain how much of their constitutional freedom their followers can be induced to sacrifice, *until after the fall election*. But our people will not bear a gag law; and every politician of common sense among us knows it. If our Southern friends can be satisfied with messages, reports and resolutions, and now and then a mob, why they can have them to order, as regularly as their returns of oats, hams, and cottons. If they ask more than this, we can tell them once for all, that they will ask vain.

Dr. Bangs and Mr. O. Scott.

It will be seen from the following letter, that Dr. Bangs is about to have an opportunity given him of making out his charge of falsehood, preferred against him by Dr. Bangs in No. 510 of the Christian Advocate. In the entire honesty—in the magnanimity of O. Scott we have some how or other—it may be from his noble bearing in the very hottest fire, of the persecution here taken up great confidence—nor can we say less of Storrs and others of his companions who, in attempting to purify their church from the leprosy of slavery have brought on themselves the fiercest wrath of its Rabbies. Now to see such men vilified and abused and persecuted at the beak and instance of oppressors who, Wesley and Clarke and Coke and Watson would have put out of the church, does show with most signal clearness how greatly slavery has perverted the original purity of its principles, and how much it stands in need of those reformers who its re-edification.

From *Zion's Watchman*.

“Palpable Falsehood.”

Dear Brother Sunderland—You have probably noticed the charge of falsehood preferred against me by Dr. Bangs in No. 510 of the Christian Advocate and Journal. This charge has been circulated through 25,000 copies of that paper, and before this time, has probably met the eye of more than 200,000 persons, scattered through the whole length and breadth of these United States. This is a serious matter, and requires immediately the most careful investigation by the proper tribunal. Several of the preachers on my district, have, in obedience to the discipline, made application to a neighboring presiding elder, to call a council as soon as convenient, and examine into the charges of Dr. Bangs; and should he find it inconvenient to attend to this business sooner, they have requested him to appoint for said council to convene at Springfield, Mass., at 9 o'clock, A. M., on Tuesday, July the 12th, it being the day preceding our ensuing annual conference. Dr. Bangs will probably be notified, and requested to attend the examination, and support his charges.

That the General Conference should have passed a resolution, charging the address with falsehood, when under the full tide of a slavery and pro-slavery excitement, and after attempts were made by brethren, slave-holders and others, to make it appear that the motives and character of the author were not to be impeached by the passage of the resolution, is not very strange. But that Dr. Bangs, after having heard the explanations and defence of the author, and having reason to believe that the success of the resolution in the General Conference depended

on that turn which was given to the subject by W. Wynans, J. Crouder, and others; which attempted to separate the *sins* from the *sinner*—I say, that Dr. Bangs in his cooler moments, should deliberately charge a brother with falsehood, or reiterate a charge of falsehood previously made, giving the truth of the allegation the sanction of *his opinion*—and that through the columns of our official paper, thus sending it to every point in the Union, and beyond the boundaries of the country, which was given to the subject by

W. Wynans, J. Crouder, and others; which attempted to separate the *sins* from the *sinner*—I say, that Dr. Bangs in his cooler moments, should deliberately charge a brother with falsehood, or reiterate a charge of falsehood previously made, giving the truth of the allegation the sanction of *his opinion*—and that through the columns of our official paper, thus sending it to every point in the Union, and beyond the boundaries of the country, which was given to the subject by

W. Wynans, J. Crouder, and others; which attempted to separate the *sins* from the *sinner*—I say, that Dr. Bangs in his cooler moments, should deliberately charge a brother with falsehood, or reiterate a charge of falsehood previously made, giving the truth of the allegation the sanction of *his opinion*—and that through the columns of our official paper, thus sending it to every point in the Union, and beyond the boundaries of the country, which was given to the subject by

W. Wynans, J. Crouder, and others; which attempted to separate the *sins* from the *sinner*—I say, that Dr. Bangs in his cooler moments, should deliberately charge a brother with falsehood, or reiterate a charge of falsehood previously made, giving the truth of the allegation the sanction of *his opinion*—and that through the columns of our official paper, thus sending it to every point in the Union, and beyond the boundaries of the country, which was given to the subject by

W. Wynans, J. Crouder, and others; which attempted to separate the *sins* from the *sinner*—I say, that Dr. Bangs in his cooler moments, should deliberately charge a brother with falsehood, or reiterate a charge of falsehood previously made, giving the truth of the allegation the sanction of *his opinion*—and that through the columns of our official paper, thus sending it to every point in the Union, and beyond the boundaries of the country, which was given to the subject by

W. Wynans, J. Crouder, and others; which attempted to separate the *sins* from the *sinner*—I say, that Dr. Bangs in his cooler moments, should deliberately charge a brother with falsehood, or reiterate a charge of falsehood previously made, giving the truth of the allegation the sanction of *his opinion*—and that through the columns of our official paper, thus sending it to every point in the Union, and beyond the boundaries of the country, which was given to the subject by

W. Wynans, J. Crouder, and